

REMARKS

Claims 1–18 are pending in the application. Claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18 have been amended. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagamatsu (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0125890) in view of Dara-Abrams et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/004680).

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner admits that Nagamatsu fails to show, teach, or suggest a server. Therefore, Nagamatsu fails to show, teach, or suggest a first server coupled to said first server connection node and said first analog signal receiver, and responsive to said first plurality of packetized test commands by packetizing and transmitting, via said first server connection node, said first plurality of measurement data as said first plurality of packetized signal data.

Dara-Abrams et al. fails to cure the deficient teachings of Nagamatsu. As best understood by Applicants, Dara-Abrams et al. disclose a system that, when a problem with a consumer electronic device is identified, provides a diagnostic procedure in order to diagnose the consumer electronic device. A remote control device is used to identify the consumer electronic device to a gateway device. When the consumer electronic device is identified, the gateway accesses a server, via an internet protocol (IP) network, in order to obtain a diagnostic procedure for the consumer electronic device, which is stored in a database of the server. When the gateway obtains the diagnostic procedure from the server, it downloads the diagnostic procedure to a testing and diagnostics device. The testing and diagnostics device interacts with the

AMENDMENT A

consumer electronic device according to the diagnostic procedure in order to provide a diagnosis of the consumer electronic device.

The Examiner cites Fig. 1, No. 20 as disclosing a first server coupled to said first server connection node and said first analog signal receiver, and responsive to said first plurality of packetized test commands by packetizing and transmitting, via said first server connection node, said first plurality of measurement data as said first plurality of packetized signal data. However, the server disclosed in Dara-Abrams et al. is merely coupled to a single connection node, namely to the IP network, whereas claim 1 requires a first server coupled to both said first server connection node and said first analog signal receiver. Furthermore, the server of Dara-Abrams et al. merely provides a diagnostic procedure that is stored in its database. As such, the server of Dara-Abrams et al. fails to packetize and transmit, via said first server connection node, a first plurality of measurement data as a first plurality of packetized signal data in response to a first plurality of packetized test commands as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1. Claims 9 and 14 are allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 14 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 each ultimately depend on claim 1 and are allowable for at least similar reasons. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4 is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18 to

AMENDMENT A


include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 609-7620.

Date: March 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,
VEDDER PRICE P.C.

By: 

Mark A. Dalla Valle
Reg. No.: 34,147

Attorney for Assignee
222 N. LaSalle St., Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Telephone: 312-609-7500
Facsimile: 312-609-5005
Customer No.L 23418
Attorney Docket: 11602.00.0010